UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,938	10/15/2003	Yee-Chia Yeo	TSM03-0926	7692
43859 SLATER & MA	7590 10/07/200 ATSIL, L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
17950 PRESTO	N ROAD, SUITE 100	MOVVA, AMAR		
DALLAS, TX	13232		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2894	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/685,938	YEO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	AWAK WOVVA	2094	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS			e appeal. Since a
3. 🛛 Th <u>e p</u> roposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: Claim 13 is substantively amended. (See 3		ottod olamno.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / inchament (	1 102 024).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owasie ii ousiiiittoa iii a ooparate,	amory mod amoriamor	it carroening the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected to:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	L NOT L	1141 - 11	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		i condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	r 1 0/30/00) raper NO(\$)		
	/Bradley K Smith/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2894	
	<i>,</i> , , •		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1. Applicant argues that even if the definition of a substrate only requires that the substrate support a layer thereon, the silicide regions (10c,10d, fig. 41) must support the isolation region (4c, fig. 41). Examiner notes, however, that the rejection states that elements 10c,10d are only part of the substrate. To the contrary the substrate includes (3,2,10c,10d, fig. 41). There is no requirement that the isolation completely overlie all parts of the substrate.
- 2. Applicant argues that if elements 10c/10d of Matsumoto could be considered part of the substrate so could 12e/12f. Examiner notes that at times the broad nature of claim language would allow for multiple interpretations of the prior art. The mere fact that there maybe multiple interpretations available to use does not preclude the ability of a specific interpretation from reading on the claims. Even assuming arguendo that examiner is forced to take applicant suggested interpretation that 12e/12f are part of the substrate, examiner notes that these plugs still support elements 13f/13e and layers thereon. Applicant further argues that that neither of the structures may be considered to be the substrate of the isolation region 4c. This argument is moot as there is no requirement that specific portions of the substrate support the isolation region. The rejection states that elements 10c,10d are only part of the substrate. To the contrary the substrate includes (3,2,10c,10d, fig. 41). There is no requirement that the isolation completely overlie all parts of the substrate.